PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	**Amount Requested**	$ 23,433,962
Proposal Title	Greater Los Angeles County IRWM Implementation Grant Application	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 156,200,674

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes 13 projects claiming the following benefit types: water supply, water quality, ecosystem restoration, recreation, and flood protection. The projects include: (1) Citywide Storm Drain Catch Basin Curb Screens Project, (2) Dominguez Channel Trash Reduction Project, (3) Dominguez Gap Spreading Grounds West Basin Percolation Improvements, (4) Foothill Municipal Water District Recycled Water Project, (5) Marsh Park, Phase II, (6) Oxford Retention Basin Multi-Use Enhancement Project, (7) Pacoima Spreading Grounds Improvements Project, (8) Peck Water Conservation Improvement, (9) San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant East Process Optimization Project, (10) South Gardena Recycled Water Pipeline Project, (11) Upper Malibu Creek Watershed Restoration, (12) Vermont Stormwater Capture and Greenstreet Project, and (13) Walnut Spreading Basin Improvements.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	8/10
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	5/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	24/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5	Program Preferences	10/10
		Total Score (max. possible = 80)	**67**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Applicant addresses all required elements of this criterion, including: goals and objectives of the proposal and how they help achieve the goals and objectives of the adopted IRWM Plan; a tabulated overview of the project which includes an abstract and project status; appropriate maps; a discussion of the synergies or linkages among projects; adequately detailed descriptions for most tasks; a listing of permits and their status including CEQA compliance; and data management and monitoring deliverables. However, the description of deliverables to DWR for assessing progress and accomplishments is not always clear, or is lacking, for several projects and tasks. For example, Project 1, tasks 4 and 9;

Project 3, task 9; Project 4, tasks 9, 10, and 11, and others. Some task descriptions should include more detail including Project 2, subtask 9.2; Project 5, task 9; Project 7, task 9, and others. While the applicant claims to have submitted plans and specifications consistent with the design tasks included in the work plan for several projects, the document cited could not always be found. For instance, for Project 7, 60% design documents were verified, but 90% design plans and final (100%) design (completed in January, 2013 and February 2013, respectively, pg. 3-114) could not be found. And some existing data and studies cited and described were not found on the referenced CD as claimed, or in BMS (e.g., Project 7 and Project 13).

BUDGET

The budgets for all the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the budget categories are not fully supported or lack detail. Some task estimates lack an explanation of how the estimate was determined as in for example Project 8, task 7; Project 9, task 9, and others. Some hourly wages seem unusually low; for example the Senior Civil Engineer (working for City of Carson), for the Dominguez Channel Trash Reduction project, at $50/hour which is less than for a Contractor Technician at $53/hour. Three projects (Project 9, Project 11, and Project 12) include cost estimates for several tasks that are based on lump sum figures or percentages, and lack adequate justification for doing so.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the proposal no later than October 2014. Further, all the required elements are provided on each project schedule including: Development of: Financing, Environmental documentation, and a Project Monitoring Plan; Project design and bid solicitation process; Identification and acquisition of all necessary permits; Construction start and end dates including significant milestones; Implementation of any environmental mitigation or enhancement efforts; Construction/Project Administration; and Progress Report and Final Report submittals. Seven of the 13 proposed projects are scheduled to begin construction before October 2014.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Two projects (Project 7 and Project 8) that include water quality improvement goals contain only vague information on water sampling locations. Several projects (Project 7, Project 12, and Project 13) propose targets that decrease bacteria loadings by billions of colonies per day. While the projects will likely reduce bacteria concentrations or densities, bacteria pollution is rarely viewed in terms of loading which is generally expressed as pounds per day of a chemical pollutant, not bacteria colonies per day (even though Total Maximum Daily Loads – TMDLs are developed for bacteria they focus on the number of allowed exceedance days of the target bacteria density, not loads in the traditional sense when applied to chemicals). These do not appear to be realistic targets for bacteria. Some measurement tools and methods metrics are not defined for some projects, including Project 1, water quality (p. 12); Project 5, open space (p. 41); Project 6, performance measures (p. 50); Project 7, water quality (p. 56) and others.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but is not fully supported by documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of all projects. The applicant adequately addresses the PSP required elements of this criterion for all, but two projects. Project 9 and Project 11 both lack a discussion on “Acknowledgement of all new facilities, policies, and actions required to obtain the physical benefits”, “Uncertainty of the benefits and factors that lead to uncertainty”, and “Description of any potential adverse physical effects.” Otherwise, the applicant adequately addresses the requirements specified in the PSP, including providing: information that clearly identifies and describes

the physical benefits of each project included in the proposal, and, technical analysis appropriate and justified considering the size of the project and the type of benefit claimed.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation. The two screening projects (Net Present Value (NPV) costs $4 million) appear economical based on the reduced cost of trash removal only. Benefits of keeping trash out of local waterways are not counted, so these appear to be good projects. The four urban park projects (NPV costs about $25.6 million) have benefits that are hard to quantify, but the projects are described well and they have a variety of social benefits that are not monetized.

Six projects with a primary water supply benefit account for most of the application costs (NPV costs about $116 million) and most of quantified benefits. The total amount of new water supply claimed is over 22,000 AFY. Most of this claim is for Project 7 (10,500) and Project 9 (8,400). Water supply benefits are generally based on the reduced costs of imported water.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that six program preferences and seven statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for 11 of the Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; (3) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; (4) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (5) Drought Preparedness; (6) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (7) Climate Change Response Actions; (8) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (9) Practice Integrated Flood Management; (10) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; and (11) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.